

Income Maintenance Advisory Committee
Department of Health and Family Services
Division of Health Care Financing
August 18, 2005
Minutes

County Attendees: **Jackie Bennett**, Racine Co.; **Sheila Drays**, Dodge Co.; **Joanne Faber**, Washington Co.; **Jane Huebsch**, Marathon Co.; **Ed Kamin**, Kenosha Co.; **Chris Machamer**, Waupaca Co.; **John Rathman**, Outagamie Co.; **Sue Schmitz**, Waukesha Co.; **Cindy Sutton**, Rock Co.

State Attendees: **Barb Apel**, DHFS/OSF; **Mary Claridge**, DHFS/BFS; **Bernadette Connolly**, DHFS/BEM; **Brian Fangmeier**, DHFS/BEM; **Thersa Fosbinder**, DHFS/BEM; **John Haine**, DHFS/BEM; **Lisa Hanson**, DHFS/BEM; **Vicki Jessup**, DHFS/BEM; **Jim Jones**, DHFS/BEM; **Bob Martin**, DHFS/BEM; **Scott Reidasch**, DHFS/BEM; **Marilyn Rudd**, DHFS/BEM; **Evie Ryan**, DHFS/BEM; **Joanne Simpson**, DHFS/BEM

Administrative Items

- June minutes will be reviewed at the September IMAC meeting.

MA Transportation

See handouts below.

Eileen McRae and Rachel Carabell from the Division of Health Care Financing asked for feedback from the IMAC on whether county IM agencies would be willing to work with a pre-approved transportation manager. Some local agencies expressed reservations about turning over their day-to-day transportation operations. Many would, however, be willing to centralize the SMV portion for people in HMOs.

Local agencies also expressed concern about ensuring that the current network of transportation providers and volunteer drivers would continue to be used and minimizing any disruption of service. Rachel wants to work with the agencies directly to gather more information on the current networks, processes and providers to address this concern.

The question was raised as to whether or not agencies could opt out of using the transportation manager. Rachel stated that this issue would be addressed after more discussions had taken place. Any other questions or concerns can be directed to Eileen McRae, 608-266-4498.

Wisconsin Funeral & Cemetery Assistance Program (WFCAP)

Scott Riedasch provided two issue papers prepared by the IMAC ad-hoc sub-committee looking at WFCAP regarding the new reporting requirement in the 2005 budget. This budget item requires local agencies to supply DHFS with information on the number of people served with WFCAP funding each year.

The first issue paper addressed how local agencies should report the data to DHFS. IMAC approved the recommendation to have a monthly spreadsheet with a minimum amount of data sent electronically to BEM. Timing of the monthly submittal will be by the first week of the second month after the month being reported. For example, January 2006 data will be due in the Department by the first week of March 2006.

In order to assure that the WFCAP reporting process proposed is effective and efficient, a pilot will be conducted for collecting August and September data from Brown, Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Richland counties. The ad hoc subcommittee will report back to the IMAC with the pilot results.

The second issue paper addresses how to reconcile the costs with the spreadsheet detail. IMAC approved the recommendation to do quarterly and end-of-year reconciliations.

The WFCAP ad-hoc sub-committee will continue to work on the program policies and process, including looking at ways to control costs. This effort will include the random sampling of WFCAP claim forms.

Medicaid Second Party Reviews

Funding is included in the 2006 biennial budget for these reviews. DHFS is looking at ways to combine the Medicaid and FoodShare review processes. The IMAC Quality Assurance Subcommittee will discuss ways to do this.

Sub-Committee Updates

IT

Current Projects

- ❖ ACCESS - The self-assessment tool has been up and running since August 2004 and around 28,000 people have completed the self-assessment. Of those that have completed the self-assessment, over 90% were eligible for one or more IM programs. The Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidy was added in June 2005. We have added language to the self-assessment results to accommodate those families and individuals who might be found eligible if Medicaid Family Fiscal Unit logic was applied or if they could qualify through the Family Medicaid Deductible.

The new 'Check My Benefits' will be implemented at the end of September 2005. This tool will allow people to see case-specific information on their BadgerCare, FoodShare, Medicaid, SeniorCare, and SSI Caretaker Supplement.

DHFS is working with DWD to see how Child Care program information could be added to ACCESS. We are also working with the Disability Determination Bureau (DDB) to see if we could add a simple 'Am I Disabled?' section to the self-assessment and the ability to query the DDB systems to determine the status of a pending disability determination.

- ❖ The Family Medicaid and FoodShare online applications will be available in the Spring of 2006 and will be done in conjunction with changes to the CARES Worker Web (CWW) to accommodate the on-line applications, as well as mail-in applications and

reviews. It is important that workers and managers understand that this effort is meant to reduce local agency workload to a more manageable level, but will still require workers to determine eligibility and, in most FoodShare cases, have a face-to-face interview with the applicant.

- ❖ CWW Implementation Update - The Western region is now using the CARES Worker Web and will transition 100% of their cases to the CWW on August 22. The Northern region has begun using the CWW as well, but will not transition their entire caseload to the CWW until the middle of September. Milwaukee and the Eastern Region have begun the CWW training process, while the Southeastern region is prepping for CWW training.
- ❖ DHFS recommends that agencies check the LAN configuration, RAM and processing speeds of their current computers to ensure that they are set up to use the CWW, and other web-based tools, efficiently.
- ❖ Additional changes to the CWW will be implemented in November, these include the asset assessment, case transfer, query screens, other modifications to improve performance, and changes made based upon feedback from local IM agency staff.
- ❖ Electronic Case File Update - Pilot counties Dane, LaCrosse, Price are now up and running. DHFS is currently working to implement the ECF in Milwaukee as well.

Training and Technical Assistance

Discussions continue on CWW rollout. Milwaukee training has begun with Milwaukee trainers. DHFS distance learning tools are being utilized.

Other Training Issues include:

- Access Website
- Self Employment Training
- New worker training
- Training Reports from Pathlore
- CWW 1.0 November Rollout

Theresa Fosbinder is looking for some information on a DWD Training Committee, because there is interest in merging the DHFS and DWD training and technical assistance committees. Jim Jones agreed to talk with Mark Moody, while local agencies agreed to discuss this with any contacts they may have.

This committee is gathering information on the amount of time it takes to complete the CWW training. The following are the current completion rates.

4 hours or less – 31%
4-6 hours – 28%
6-10 hours – 11%
10-15 hours – 13%
15 hours or more – 18%

The Training Call Center is still running well, and calls continue to come in daily.

FoodShare Payment Accuracy

See handouts below.

DHFS has not yet received information about how FNS will treat the at risk money for 2004 (i.e. reinvestment, waive, payback).

**Transportation Management System
Decision Items for the Request-for-Proposal**

A. Payment Structure

Department Recommendation: Consider one of the following payment systems:

- A capitated payment system
- Administrative payments

B. Minimum/Maximum Number of Contracts/Regions

Department Recommendation: Divide the state into five regions, but allow bidders to submit proposal on multiple regions.

C. Direct Services Provided by Contractor

Department Recommendation:

- Limit the number of trips provided directly by the contractor to 25 percent of all trips. This requirement could be waived if exceptional access problems arise.
- Limit the portion of the contract available for administrative services.

D. Provider Network

Department Recommendation: Require contractor to describe how it would use existing SMV provider and volunteer driver networks. Provide contractor with a list of Medicaid-certified SMV providers and encourage contractor to work with county and Tribal agencies to compile a list of volunteer drivers and other providers in their community.

E. Timeliness of Payments

Department Recommendation: Establish the following requirement for providers:

- xx percent of clean claims paid within 30 days of processing.
- xx percent of clean claims paid within 90 days of processing.
- xx percent of clean claims paid within 100 days of processing.

F. Evaluation of Proposals

Department Recommendation: Limit the score for the cost portion of a proposal to 20-30 percent of the total score possible. The remainder of the score will be based on the technical proposal and vendor experience.

G. Quality and Access Considerations

Department Recommendation: Establish performance standards with financial penalties assessed if contractor exceeds tolerance levels. We would need to determine the level of tolerance for indicated measures. At a minimum, the indicators would include the following:

- **Lead time** – The transportation manager will be required to ensure that a ride is available for recipients who request a pick-up at least xx hours in advance.
- **Timely pick-ups/drop-offs** – To be considered on time, the transportation manager would be required to pick-up riders within xx minutes of the scheduled pick-up time.
- **Wait Time** -- The wait should be no more than xx minutes in rural areas, and xx minutes in urban areas.
- **Duration of trip** - Recipients should not have their trips extended by more than xx minutes in rural areas and xx minutes in urban areas due to group rides.
- **Providers** – The transportation manager will be required to ensure that all vehicles meet Department of Transportation requirements for human service vehicles. Volunteer drivers would not be held to this standard.
- **Interpreter services** – The transportation manager will be required to respond to calls or questions from recipients who are hearing impaired or who has limited English proficiency.
- **Telephone response time:** At least xx percent of all incoming calls are answered within 3 rings
 - ✓ No more than x percent of incoming calls ring busy
 - ✓ No answered call is in the queue for longer than xx minutes
- **Hours of operation (regular and holiday)** – Dispatcher:
- **Hours of operation (regular and holiday)** – Service providers:
- **Grievance Process** – The RFP could outline provider and recipient grievance procedures/requirements that are similar to those required in the HMO contracts (see attached example).

H. Reporting Requirements

Department Recommendation:

- Require the contractor to submit the following trip information:
 - ✓ Recipient name
 - ✓ Recipient identification number
 - ✓ Distance traveled (mileage)
 - ✓ Scheduled and actual pick-up times
 - ✓ Date and time of request
 - ✓ Type of vehicle (e.g. van, car, bus) and whether it was vendor-owned/operated
- Require the contractor to submit monthly summary reports to include the following:
 - ✓ Number of trips authorized and completed
 - ✓ Number of recipients transported
 - ✓ Call statistics
 - Number of calls
 - Percent of calls answered timely (per contract requirements)
 - Percent of calls with busy signals
 - Percent of abandoned calls
 - ✓ Number of transportation providers, by type
 - ✓ Number of formal and informal complaints received
 - ✓ Number and types of complaints (e.g., no-show, safety) resolved
 - ✓ Number of claims paid
 - ✓ Average days for claims payment
 - ✓ Number of provider no-shows
 - ✓ Number of denials for lack of service

I. Cost Sharing

Department Recommendation: The current cost sharing policy includes a \$1.00 copayment for transportation by specialized medical vehicle. There is no cost sharing requirement for common carrier services.

J. Access to Recipient Eligibility Information

Department Recommendation: Provide the contractor(s) with access to pertinent eligibility information.

K. Coordination with Medicaid Health Care Providers

Department Recommendation: To the extent allowable under state and federal law, permit the contractor(s) to have direct contact with health care providers for purposes related to the arrangement and verification of transportation.

L. Implementation Phase-In

Department Recommendation: Award regional contracts and implement all regions within six months of awarding contracts.

M. Duration of Contract

Department Recommendation: Initial contract term of 3 years, but allow annual rate negotiation.

DHFS/DHCF
May 4, 2005

Medicaid Transportation Management Initiative

- The Medicaid transportation management initiative will include non-emergency transportation services currently provided under the common carrier benefit (as authorized by county and tribal agencies) and by Medicaid-certified specialized medical vehicle (SMV) providers. Transportation by emergency medical vehicle is not included in this initiative.
- The initiative seeks to:
 - Improve access to Medicaid-covered NET services through better coordination of services:
 - ✓ Services are now coordinated on a county-by-county basis through local economic support agencies or their designees and there is no coordination for SMV services
 - ✓ In some areas, there are more than enough transportation providers and in other areas, there is little or no transportation available
 - ✓ The manager will be required to guarantee access to transportation services in all areas of the region served
 - ✓ Under the proposed system, the transportation manager would be responsible for obtaining the most appropriate means of transportation for the consumer
 - ✓ Current Medicaid providers would have the opportunity to be part of the current system and, in most cases, would be relieved of some of the current administrative requirements
 - Simplify and Improve Customer Service:
 - ✓ Customers would have a single point of contact
 - ✓ The transportation manager would be required to provide consistent and reliable service hours at the call center, including evening and weekend hours for making appointments
 - ✓ Customers would have improved access through availability of interpreter and TTY services
 - ✓ The manager would be required to coordinate services by linking consumers with providers and streamlining the requirements for scheduling trips, especially in situations where the consumer has regular appointments
 - ✓ To the extent possible, the manager will work with existing transportation networks, including current Medicaid providers and volunteer drivers
 - ✓ The manager will be held responsible for ensuring customer satisfaction
 - Increase accountability:
 - ✓ The manager will verify Medicaid eligibility, rather than the individual provider
 - ✓ The manager will have a formal and informal grievance process
 - ✓ The manager will be held accountable for quality, safety and timeliness of the providers
- The Department of Health and Family Services has convened a statewide advisory committee, which includes consumers, urban and rural providers, and representatives from county and tribal economic support agencies, to provide feedback on major program recommendations.
- To ensure that the system meets the needs of consumers, the Department is also seeking input from consumers and consumer representatives outside of the advisory committee.
- The anticipated implementation date is July 1, 2006.

Draft

Draft

Timeline for Transportation Management Initiative

5/04/05	First meeting with stakeholders
6/09/05	Telephone conference with Governor's Committee for People with Disabilities
7/25/05	Budget signed, Governor directs DHFS to implement initiative
8/18/05	Tentatively meet with County Income Maintenance Advisory Committee
Aug/Sept	Meet with various consumer groups
9/08/05	Second meeting with stakeholders
9/22/05	Presentation to SMV Association of Wisconsin
10/03/05	Submit RFP to DOA
10/14/05	Submit waiver to DOA
11/21/05	Submit waiver to CMS
11/25/05	Release RFP
1/13/06	Close accepting RFPs
3/31/06	Announce accepted RFP
5/01/06	Sign contract
7/01/06	Program implementation

DHCF/DHFS
August 8, 2005

Wisconsin Funeral and Cemetery Aids Program Reporting Requirements Proposal

ISSUE:

What method will local agencies be required to follow to report required data to the Department of Health and Family Services on deceased individuals for whom the local agencies seek reimbursement for funeral and cemetery expenses?

BACKGROUND:

The 2005-2007 Wisconsin Biennial Budget, as passed by the Legislature, requires the local agencies to report certain required data to the Department of Health and Family Services as a condition of reimbursement under the Wisconsin Funeral and Cemetery Aids Program. The required data includes, for each deceased individual for whom counties and tribes seek reimbursement:

- a) the total cemetery costs, if any;
- b) the total funeral and burial costs, if any; and
- c) the amount the county or tribe paid for each of these types of costs.

This is a new requirement and, as such, a method for local agencies to report the data to DHFS is needed. Further, a process must be developed for DHFS to collect/compile the data and make the appropriate reimbursement to the local agency. Coordination with the Community Aids Reporting System (CARS) will be necessary to ensure that this new reporting requirement is met prior to reimbursement to the local agencies for funeral and cemetery expenses. DHFS activities surrounding this required data are discussed in another issue paper.

DATA ELEMENTS:

The following data elements could be collected from the WFCAP Reimbursement Request, which was implemented in February 2005. Those items marked "Required" are either specifically required by the new statutory provision, or would be necessary in order to link those required data to a local agency and deceased individual:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| • Local Agency Name/Number (will be added to the current form) | REQUIRED |
| • Name of Deceased Individual (First, MI, Last) | REQUIRED |
| • Social Security Number | |
| • Date of Death | |
| • MA Recipient (Yes/No) | REQUIRED |
| • Allowable Category (If MA Recipient) | |
| • W2 Paid Placement (Yes/No) | REQUIRED |
| • Other Qualifying Individual (Yes/No) | REQUIRED |
| • Type of Other Qualifying Individual | |
| • Authorized Date of Reimbursement | |
| • Total Funeral Cost | REQUIRED |
| • Authorized Funeral Reimbursement | REQUIRED |
| • Month/Year Funeral Reimbursement Paid (will be added to form) | REQUIRED |
| • Total Cemetery Cost | REQUIRED |
| • Authorized Cemetery Reimbursement | REQUIRED |
| • Month/Year Cemetery Reimbursement Paid (will be added to form) | REQUIRED |
| • Special Circumstances (Yes/No) | |
| • Type of Special Circumstances | |
| • Authorized Special Circumstances Reimbursement | |

SHORT TERM SOLUTION:

Options:

- Local agencies would complete an Excel spreadsheet that includes only the minimum data required for all individuals included in that month's CARS reimbursement request. The local agency would e-mail the file to a central point in the Department.
- Local agencies would complete an Excel spreadsheet that expands the amount of data that is reported to include most of the fields found on the WFCAP Reimbursement Request. The file would include data for all individuals included in that month's CARS reimbursement request. The file would be e-mailed to a central point in the Department.
- Local agencies would either FAX or mail copies of the WFCAP Reimbursement Request form and "Statement of Goods and Services Selected" for all individuals included in that month's CARS reimbursement request to a central point in the Department.
- Local Agencies would complete an Excel spreadsheet that includes only the minimum data required for all individuals included in that month's CARS reimbursement request. The local agencies would e-mail the file to a central point in the Department. The local agencies would also FAX the claim form to a central point in the Department.

Recommendation:

While the collection of WFCAP data will begin on January 1, 2006, there is no new administrative funding associated with the requirement at the state or local agency level. Therefore, it is important to choose a data collection method that will produce the least amount of work for all.

The WFCAP Subcommittee recommends that a monthly Excel spreadsheet including the minimum data be submitted electronically to a central contact in DHFS. Data included in the report should be for those claims paid during the month. The total of all paid amounts for those claims should equal the total amount of the CARS reimbursement request.

To test the process and determine the workload for both local agency and Department staff, a pilot of at least one month will be run. Modifications to the spreadsheet and the process will be discussed once the pilot results are known.

LONG TERM SOLUTION:

Options:

- Scan the WFCAP Reimbursement Request into the Electronic Case File. Key data from the scanned images into a database.
- Develop a web based form where the counties could enter reimbursement request data.
- Centralized processing of WFCAP reimbursement requests with DHFS.
- Continue using the short term solution.

Discussion:

The use of the Electronic Case File (ECF) images has been discussed and dropped as an option. The ECF will only contain files of recipients on CARES. Since most SSI recipients are not in CARES and since a significant number of WFCAP individuals are SSI recipients, ECF will not provide a viable option.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2,500 individuals annually for whom WFCAP pays all or a portion of the funeral and cemetery costs. Development of a web based form would not be cost efficient due to the low volume of cases.

Centralized processing of WFCAP reimbursement requests with DHFS is an option in the future only if resources (staffing and administrative funding) were to be made available to the Department. At this time, this option is also not viable.

Therefore, the only remaining option would be for the Department to continue using the short term solution.

Wisconsin Funeral and Cemetery Aids Program Data Reconciliation Proposal

ISSUE:

What method will be used by the Department to reconcile local agency reported data to the CARS reimbursement requests?

BACKGROUND:

Effective January 1, 2006, local agencies will be required, as a condition for reimbursement, to submit the following data for each deceased individual for whom they seek reimbursement of WFCAP expenses:

- a) the total cemetery costs, if any;
- b) the total funeral and burial costs, if any; and
- c) the amount the county or tribe paid for each of these types of costs.

The statutory language requires submission of only a minimal amount of data. The WFCAP Reimbursement Request form and the additional "Statement of Goods and Services" from the funeral directors would provide all of the required data, plus a significant amount of additional data that is currently not required to be submitted to the Department, but that would be useful for program evaluation purposes.

Based on a recommendation from the WFCAP Subcommittee, it is assumed that the local agencies will only report the minimal data on a monthly basis. If a local agency has no data to report for a month, an e-mail must be sent to the WFCAP coordinator reporting \$0 expenses.

OPTIONS:

- Monthly Reconciliation. The WFCAP data coordinator would monthly reconcile the monthly submissions from the local agencies to the CARS Expenditure Report to verify that actual expenditure data reported equals the CARS reimbursement request. A threshold will be set based on results of a pilot to be run in the fall of 2005. Any discrepancies over the threshold would need to be resolved with the local agency.
- Quarterly Reconciliation. The WFCAP data coordinator would quarterly reconcile the monthly submissions from the local agencies to the CARS Expenditure Report to verify that actual expenditure data reported equals the CARS reimbursement request. A threshold will be set based on results of a pilot to be run in the fall of 2005. Any discrepancies over the threshold would need to be resolved with the local agency.
- Annual Reconciliation. The WFCAP data coordinator would annually reconcile the monthly submissions from the local agencies to the CARS Expenditure Report to verify that actual expenditure data reported equals the CARS reimbursement request. A threshold will be set based on results of a pilot to be run in the fall of 2005. Any discrepancies over the threshold would need to be resolved with the local agency.
- Quarterly and Year-End Reconciliation. The WFCAP data coordinator would quarterly reconcile the monthly submissions from the local agencies to the CARS Expenditure Report to verify that actual expenditure data reported equals the CARS reimbursement request. A threshold will be set based on results of a pilot to be run in the fall of 2005. Any discrepancies over the quarterly threshold would need to be resolved with the local agency. All discrepancies that remain at the year-end reconciliation must be resolved with the local agency.

RECOMMENDATION:

The new requirement for WFCAP data collection is vague as to what the Department needs to do with the data. Therefore, merely confirming that data was submitted to the WFCAP coordinator would meet the letter, if not the intent of the new legislation. Considering that no additional staffing or administrative funds were provided for this mandate, the Department would be justified in merely confirming receipt of data without conducting a detailed reconciliation of actual versus reported expenditures.

However, no significant benefit would be realized by simply meeting this basic requirement. Therefore, a routine review of the actual claim data is recommended to reconcile with the reported expenditures.

The Subcommittee recommends that reconciliation should be completed quarterly with a final year-end reconciliation. Timing of the monthly submittal will be by the first week of the second month after the month being reported. For example, January 2006 data will be due in the Department by the first week of March 2006. For the year-end reconciliation, all adjusting data must be submitted to the Department no later than the first week in April of the following year. For example, Calendar Year 2006 data will be due in the Department by the first week of April 2007.

A second issue for discussion is what action the Department will take if actual expenditures do not reconcile to the CARS reimbursement request for the time period in question. If the local agencies submit expenditure data totaling the amount of the CARS monthly reimbursement request, there would be no issue. However, if there was a discrepancy between these amounts, then the Department's reconciler would need to work with the local agency to document the resolution.

It is recommended that a threshold percentage be developed as a result of the pilot study. As long as the local agency reports within the threshold for the quarter, no action would need to be taken. However, final reconciliations between CARS and WFCAP data must equal.

It will be a local agency decision on who within the agency will complete the required spreadsheet and submit to the WFCAP data coordinator. The Department will create an Excel spreadsheet template that local agencies will use to report the data.

FoodShare Error Data FY'05
(Oct - March)

State Summary				
Review Month	Sample	Allotment	Error Amount	Error Rate
Oct-04	83	\$17,123	\$440	2.57%
Nov-04	84	\$17,217	\$1,073	6.23%
Dec-04	87	\$15,152	\$915	6.04%
Jan-05	92	\$17,885	\$929	5.19%
Feb-05	90	\$17,112	\$1,026	6.00%
Mar-05	91	\$18,208	\$1,030	5.66%
Total	527	\$102,697	\$5,413	5.27%

Milwaukee				
Review Month	Sample	Allotment	Error Amount	Error Rate
Oct-04	37	\$8,022	\$256	3.19%
Nov-04	34	\$6,853	\$758	11.06%
Dec-04	36	\$6,525	\$261	4.00%
Jan-05	37	\$7,157	\$449	6.27%
Feb-05	34	\$7,438	\$559	7.52%
Mar-05	36	\$7,913	\$434	5.48%
Total	214	\$43,908	\$2,717	6.19%

Balance of State				
Review Month	Sample	Allotment	Error Amount	Error Rate
Oct-04	46	\$9,101	\$184	2.02%
Nov-04	50	\$10,364	\$315	3.04%
Dec-04	51	\$8,627	\$654	7.58%
Jan-05	55	\$10,728	\$480	4.47%
Feb-05	56	\$9,733	\$467	4.80%
Mar-05	55	\$10,295	\$596	5.79%
Total	313	\$58,848	\$2,696	4.58%

	IT 2004	FY 2005	RATE	FS 2004	EI 2005	RATE
	PAYMENT	PAYMENT	REDUCTION	VAN_ NEC SITE	VAL. NEGATIVE	REDUCTION
STATE	ERROR RATE	ERROR RATE	(IF APPLICABLE)	ERROR RATE	ERROR KATE	(IF APPLICABLE)
		7 lowest rates	3 most improved		4 lmvst rates	2 most improved
CONNECTICUT	4.94	6.69	-1.75	1.99	2.23	-0.24
MAINE	10.97	6.15	482	7.03	1.01	6.02
MASSACHUSETTS	496	3.79	0.97	2.81	2.43	11.38
NEW HAMPSHIRE	7.10	6.76	0.34	0.66	1.96	-130
NEW YORK	5.74	6.10	-1136	3.00	7.61	-4.61
RHODE ISLAND	1130	10.79	2.51	9.23	8.16	3.07
VERMONT	513	5.82	-0.69	10.26	4.51	5.75
DELAWARE	6.24	5.97	0.27	12.87	3.23	9.64
DIST. OF COL.	5.65	7.45	-1.80	7.04	5.56	IAN
MARYLAND	5.3	5.45	0.38	13.42	26.63	-13,21
NEW JERSEY	3.01	3.35	-0.34	2.37	0.33	2.04
PENNSYLVANIA	400	4.34	-0.34	3.40	1.32	2.08
VIRGINIA°	69	6.16	0.43	2.54	2.59	-0.05
VIRGIN ISLANDS	4-79	1.12	3.66	7.32	9.55	-2.23
WEST VIRGINIA	658	5.22	136	5.29	5.58	-11.29
ALABAMA	x09	2.59	5.41	2.25	1.39	186
FLORIDA	616	7.12	-11.96	2.54	1.41	1.13
GEORGIA	6.21	5.29	1192	3.90	5.34	-1.44
KENTUCKY	5.63	3.57	2.06	7.26	3.13	413
MISSISSIPPI	5.89	377	2.12	2.04	1.61	0.43
NORTH CAROLINA	3.17	2.80	037	3.06	2.26	0.811
SOUTH CAROLINA	6.25	8.14	-1.89	0.33	1.05	.11.72
TENNESSEE	6.69	5.48	1.21	7.74	4.72	3.02
ILLINOIS	5.61	6.67	-tab	8.95	9,85	-0.90
INDIANA	584	6.30	.11,46	5.20	3.86	134
MICHIGAN	7.19	7.48	-0.29	14.19	14.21	-0.112
MINNESOTA	6.94	7.26	-0.32	1.22	0.00	1.22
OHIO	8.43	8.96	-0.53	5.11	6.45	-11.34
WISCONSIN		5.27	1.38	- 5.97	7.27	-1.30
						1.1111
ARKANSAS	534	5.67	-0.33	4.98	4.13	11.85
LOUISIANA	483	5.21	-0.40	4.58	3.03	1.55
NEW MEXICO	5.59	5.55	0.04	1.55	4.17	-2.62
OKLAHOMA	5.90	7.11	-1.21	3.79	5.13	-1.34
TEXAS	4.12	5.02	-0.90	3.29	5.16	-1.87
COLORADO	2.93	6.06	-2.13	1.74	14.86	-13,12
IOWA	6.19	5.72	0.47	3.32	1.59	1.73
KANSAS	5.11	6.04	-0.93	3.43	3.92	-0.49
MISSOURI	7.42	4.29	3.13	5.03	3.47	1.56
MONTANA	4.60	3.96	0.64	1.02	0.47	0.55
NEBRASKA	5.60	4.83	0.77	0.22	0.00	0.22
NORTH DAKOTA	4.15	3.11	1.04	2.19	0.00	2.19
SOUTH DAKOTA	1.97	1.84	0.13	0.83	0.56	1.27
UTAH	3.76	4.00	-0.24	4.92	10.14	-5.22
WYOMING	4.69	6.86	-2.17	0.79	2.46	-1.67
ALASKA	6.96	6.80	0.16	2.60	0.00	2.60
ARIZONA	654	7.69	-1.15	6.11	4.94	1.17
CALIFORNIA	6.32	5.26	1.116	8.66	9.76	-110
C. I. SAM	6.61	6.33	0.28	18.29	20.83	-2.54
HAWAII	435	4.98	-0.63	2.40	3.69	-1.29
IDAHO	9.05	4.59	4.46	10.69	13.41	-2.72
NEVADA	751	2.17	5.34	3.56	5.59	-2.03
OREGON	7.86	7.29	0.57	2.41	2.21	11.20
NORTH MONTANA	162	3.84	3.7N	3.70	1.23	2.47
TOTAL	5.6x	5.65	0,23	5.08	5.50	

Comparison of Active and Negative On regressed Error Rate Data FY 2004 and FY 2005 (Oct - March) Lowest and Most Improved

Caseload Change for Brown, Dane, Kenosha, Racine and Rock

	FY '03 Error Rate	FY '04 Error Rate	FY '05 (6 mos) Error Rate	Change of Rate '03-'05	Change of Rate '04-'05	Caseload FY'03 Ave.	Caseload FY '04 Ave.	Caseload FY'05 (6 mos.) Ave.	Caseload Change '03-'05	Caseload Change '04-'05
Brown	1070%	5.10%	2.70%	52%	47%	3,422	4,038	4,650	18%	15%
Dane	4.01%	3.75%	4.43%	6%	-18%	6,596	7,318	7,956	11%	9%
Kenosha	6.58%	5.11%	5.14%	22%	-1%	4,042	4,783	5,385	18%	13%
Racine	3.78%	2.47%	1.94%	35%	21%	4,312	4,781	5,110	11%	7%
Rock	9.30%	8.40%	3.90%	10%	54%	4,092	4,608	4,954	13%	8%

Brown

1. Double digit percentage decrease in the error rate
2. Double digit percentage increase in caseload

Dane

1. Error rate decrease of 6% from '03 -'04 and an 18% increase from '04 -'05
2. Caseload increase in both years, smaller change from '04 '05

Kenosha

1. Error rate decrease of 22% from '03 -'04 and a 1% increase from '04 -'05
2. Double digit percentage caseload increase for both years

Racine

1. Double digit percentage decrease in the error rate
2. Caseload increase in both years, smaller change from '04 '05

Rock

1. Decrease in error rate for both years, 54% from '04 -'05
2. Caseload increase in both years, smaller change from '04 -'05

FY '05 Data					
	Sample	Allotment	\$ in Error	Error Rate	
Brown	19	\$3,781	\$102	2.70%	
Dane	28	\$5,105	\$226	4.43%	
Kenosha	21	\$4,400	\$226	5.14%	
Racine	18	\$3,454	\$67	1.94%	
Rock	17	\$3,320	\$130	3.92%	
Totals	103	\$20,060	\$751	3.74%	

Large Agency Error Rate Data: FY'03 - FY'05 (Oct-March)
30 Data Points

Review Month	Brown Rate	Dane Rate	Kenosha Rate	Racine Rate	Rock Rate
Oct-02	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.3%
Nov-02	8.65%	15.30%	35.51%	0.00%	5.9%
Dec-02	10.69%	8.75%	0.00%	12.20%	5.1%
Jan-03	0.00%	5.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Feb-03	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.19%	26.9%
Mar-03	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Apr-03	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.5%
May-03	11.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Jun-03	28.46%	5.94%	20.48%	19.66%	8.4%
Jul-03	56.16%	0.00%	0.00%	5.40%	0.0%
Aug-03	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Sep-03	30.33%	4.58%	13.98%	0.00%	19.8%
FY '03	10.70%	4.01%	6.58%	3.78%	9.3%
Oct-03	0.00%	6.35%	19.22%	0.00%	8.7%
Nov-03	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Dec-03	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	3.03%	0.0%
Jan-04	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Feb-03	10.05%	4.51%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Mar-03	0.00%	0.00%	11.04%	0.00%	5.2%
Apr-03	0.00%	9.34%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
May-03	10.33%	16.08%	0.00%	7.24%	0.0%
Jun-03	0.00%	0.00%	23.98%	0.00%	0.0%
Jul-03	0.00%	5.48%	3.72%	6.23%	45.8%
Aug-03	24.71%	0.00%	0.00%	13.57%	46.2%
Sep-03	7.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.9%
FY '04	5.01%	3.75%	5.11%	2.47%	- 8.4%
Oct-04	8.32%	14.19%	0.00%	11.86%	0.0%
Nov-04	0.00%	0.00%	19.88%	0.00%	0.0%
Dec-04	0.00%	7.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Jan-OS	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	24.9%
Feb-05	0.00%	0.00%	8.31%	2.90%	0.0%
Mar-05	14.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.8%
FY '05	2.70%	4.43%	5.14%	1.94%	3.9%
Total	6.66%	4.00%	5.68%	2.94%	8.0%